UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/614,810	07/12/2000	Wilhelmus Hendrikus Alfonsus Bruls	PHN 17,546	7259

24737 7590 05/22/2003

PHILIPS ELECTRONICS NORTH AMERICAN CORP
580 WHITE PLAINS RD
TARRYTOWN, NY 10591

EXAMINER	
DIEP, NHON THANH	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2613	11

DATE MAILED: 05/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/614,810	BRULS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nhon T Diep	2613	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 08 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

   (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

   (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

   NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. ☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.

6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☐ will not be entered or b)☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: *None*.

   Claim(s) objected to: *None*.

   Claim(s) rejected: *1-21*.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. ☒ Other: *see attached sheets.*

NHON DIEP
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attached sheets

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 5/8/2003, regarding claims 1-21 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

First of all, with regard to claim 1 (similarly claims 13, 17, 18 and 20): Claim 1, line 3 recites "characterized in that said signal samples are transformed coefficients (c (I, j)) obtained by transformed coding of the information signal". There is a contradiction between "transformed coefficients" and "(c (I, j))". Page 4 of the specification discloses "The DCT yields a block 103 of 8X8 **transform coefficient y(i, j)** as shown in figure 1B." (lines 10-11) and later on lines 16-18, the specification differently discloses "Figure 1C shows a block of **quantized coefficient c (I, j)**. The coefficient values shown in this figure are the quantized versions of the corresponding coefficients (DCT coefficients) shown in figure 1B". The examiner interprets **transform coefficients** as recited in claim 1 (similarly claims 13, 17, 18 and 20) are **DCT transform coefficients** not as **quantized coefficients**.

Secondly, with regard to the applicants' argument that such features include "modifying said selected coefficient so as to represent an auxiliary data symbol" and "transform coefficients obtained by transform coding the information signal, modified so as to represent said symbols" are not anticipated by Hartung et al (page 2, lines 7-13). The examiner respectfully disagrees. Figure 6 clearly shows that "after the inverse quantization we have one DCT coefficient of the current block (= selected coefficient). We then add the corresponding DCT coefficient from the transformed watermark block (= modifying said selected coefficient so as to represent an auxiliary data symbol), yielding a watermarked DCT coefficient. We then quantize and

Huffman encode the watermark coefficient, together with its preceding run of zero coefficients (transform coefficients obtained by transform coding the information signal, modified so as to represent said symbols)" and therefore, it is submitted that Hartung et al anticipates the above limitations.

Lastly, with regard to the applicants' argument that "Hartung only discloses:

"**After the inverse quantization we have one DCT coefficient of the current block. We then add the corresponding DCT coefficient from the transformed watermark block, yielding a watermark DCT coefficient**". However, nowhere is it disclosed in Hartung et al that the watermarked DCT coefficient represents any kind of symbol." (page 2, lines 14-25). Again, the examiner respectfully disagrees. It is submitted that the process of embedding information into multimedia is called watermarking (Abstract of hartung et al) and that "yielding a watermarked DCT coefficient" represents embedded information into a the compressed bit stream. The examiner therefore, maintains all of his rejections as set forth in paper #7.